DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 837 FL 020 872

AUTHOR Sudermann, David P.
TITLE Instruction Time in the Beginning Languages at St. Olaf College: Report and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Planning Group.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Course Content; Curriculum Development; Educational Objectives; *Faculty Workload; *Graduation Requirements; Higher Education; *Introductory Courses; Language Teachers; *Scheduling; *Staff Utilization; Student Characteristics; *Time Factors (Learning)
IDENTIFIERS *Saint Olaf College MN

ABSTRACT

The report offers a comparison of instruction time for beginning languages at St. Olaf College (Minnesota) and 17 other colleges and universities, and concludes with recommendations for curricular change at St. Olaf College. Contact hours ranged from 80 hours (St. Olaf) to 171 hours. The study was undertaken in response to faculty concern that not enough classroom time was being devoted to introductory language learning. It is recommended that the college adopt a 5-day-per-week schedule for introductory language classes, rather than the existing 3-day-per-week schedule. The analysis presented includes data on student use of time on the days not currently scheduled for language instruction (Tuesdays and Thursdays). Implications of the plan for teaching effectiveness, departmental planning, faculty workload, staff scheduling, and balance of quality and quantity of instruction are discussed. Issues raised are answered in a question-and-answer format. Appended materials include a statement of the general goals of foreign language study, a profile of the foreign language training of St. Olaf graduates of 1986, objectives for an adequate foreign language graduation requirement, and a strategy for gradual curriculum revision. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352837

INSTRUCTION TIME IN THE BEGINNING LANGUAGES AT ST. OLAF COLLEGE: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC PLANNING GROUP

Prepared by David P. Sudermann

February 1987

Abstract

The "Instruction Time" report and its supplement, "An Adequate Foreign Language Requirement: Objectives and Strategy," offer a detailed account of instruction time for beginning languages at St. Olaf (80 contact hours per year), comparing that with amounts at seventeen other colleges and universities (range 80 to 171 contact hours). The report develops a rationale for increasing instruction time, treats a variety of possible objections, examines issues of teaching loads and staffing for an expanded schedule, and offers recommendations. The supplement includes statements on the general goals of foreign language study, a critique of the requirement at St. Olaf, a complete foreign language profile of the class of '86, and concludes with a set of objectives for an adequate foreign language requirement.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David P. Sudermann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

FL 020 872

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTION TIME IN THE BEGINNING LANGUAGES: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC PLANNING GROUP

History

During President George's visits to foreign language departments in 1985 and 1986, many of us voiced dissatisfaction with the three-period-per-week schedule for beginning language courses. Some of us believe that the single most practical and immediate step toward improving beginning language study at St. Olaf would be to increase instruction time. With encouragement from President George to consider together a proposal (Section I) along these lines, several of us convened an ad hoc group to discuss the idea. As a basis for discussion, the conveners researched the various ramifications of change and prepared a tentative rationale. The planning group met three times (Nov. 12, Nov. 24, Dec. 3, 1986) to air arguments for and against increasing instruction time. Each FL department and section was represented. As a result of this review, the planning group decided to focus attention on the schedule in FL 11 and 12(14) and to exclude FL 31 or 34 from consideration. In addition, we agreed to prepare for all FL colleagues a report laying out the arguments for change (Section II), which would also treat the implications of schedule modifications for teaching loads, staffing, and student schedules (Sections III, IV). Questions and reservations voiced informally, we felt, also needed to be addressed (Section III). This report and its recommendations might then be brought forward for discussion in a common meeting of all FL faculty in the spring semester.

I. Recommendations and Guidelines

The planning group presents for discussion the following recommendations:

1) that instruction in introductory language classes (FL 11, 12[14]) increase from 180 minutes per week to a minimum of 240 minutes and four periods or to a maximum of 280 minutes and five periods per week. This would result in an increase of contact hours from 80 to 104-121 contact hours per year;

2) that each FL department or section retain the option of allocating and organizing this time to match its own program and needs;

3) that issues of staffing and teaching loads be resolved jointly by the FL departments in consultation with the Administration.

Patterns for the various languages might take the following form:

	Weekly Model	Explanation	Min./Week
Chinese, Russian	3x60 + 2x50	MWF=I;TTh=P	280
Classics	4x60 (+1x60 opt.)	MTWF=I(P)	240
French,German Norwegian	3x50 + 2x50	MWF=I;TTh=P	250
Spanish	3x60 + 1x60	MWF=I;T=P;Th=P 1/2 class T 1/2 class Th	240

[I = Instruction; P = Practice/Drill]

These three recommendations must be understood within the context of the guidelines below which defined the area of the planning group's discussion. The guidelines receive more detailed consideration in the subsequent "Rationale" section.

1) Student workloads should not increase substantially. Our intention is not to demand effort beyond the seven to nine hours per week of preparation now expected, but to pace, focus, utilize fully, and make more efficient what students are now encouraged to do. In some cases departments may choose to expand the syllabus slightly to cover the first year textbook completely in two semesters.

2) Student choices for Tuesday-Thursday classes should not be reduced significantly. In particular the new schedules ought not interfere with patterns for writing courses, Level I religion courses, science labs, or music organizations.

3) "More" does not automatically mean "better." We need to establish specifically how the added instruction time can improve introductory courses, but also to consider broadly how the FL teaching-learning experience can be made more meaningful. In both regards our recommendations need to be grounded in our own classroom experience as well as current scholarly thinking on FL learning.

4) Teaching loads should not rise above the current nine hours per week for three courses.

5) The implications of schedule changes for staff and for classroom space must be recognized and described. Our primary objective, however, is to prepare recommendations that support liberal arts goals with sound pedagogy. Questions of staffing, compensation, and space can be addressed together with the Administration in a second stage of deliberation.

II. Rationale

The Limits of the Three-day Schedule

Many of us come initially to address the constraints of the three-day schedule through frustration in teaching our own beginning language classes. This is not to say that our work lacks substance or that students do not benefit from it. It does mean that the current schedule forces us to pare our courses to the bone and imposes restrictions that diminish the integrity of instruction in specific ways:

1) Active classroom practice is severely limited; students seldom reach a satisfactory level of semi-automatic oral response in basic expressions and simple transformations. In Latin and Greek, where the speaking-listening skills are not taught, three periods do not suffice for many students to digest and master the complicated structural systems and catalogues of forms.

2) For a subject that demands daily study and practice, it is difficult to focus and pace student efforts on an every-other-day schedule.

3) The liberal arts substance of our courses remains unacceptably low. By "liberal arts" we designate both the linguistic and the cultural-social dimensions that orient and give direction to language study.

4) Sufficient time for review and testing is lacking.

5) Not all of the eight languages we offer cover entirely the first-year text (the rudiments of the structure) in the first year of study.

Two lines of reasoning converge below to make the case for expanding the current three-day schedule. The first has as its theme the pedagogical value of a four- or five-day mode set in contrast to the current pattern. The second engages the schedule question from a student perspective to show that a schedule change can make FL study more meaningful.

Pedagogical Benefits of an Expanded Schedule

Increased practice.— With more contact time (expanded from the current 80 hours per year to 104-121 hours), the proportion of oral practice to explana-

tion in English increases sharply. In other words, the amount of necessary structure clarification in English would remain about the same for either the three-period or an expanded model. As it now stands, perhaps 30-35 min. of each MWF class are devoted to practice/drill for a total of 90-105 min. per week. If one period of 60 min. were added, 50 min. of which were devoted to drill, practice time increases by roughly 50%. If two periods of 50 min. each were added, where 45 min. of each class were spent in drill, then practice time grows by 85%-100%. The result in either case significantly strengthens oral practice, even if a larger portion of total classtime were allotted to testing or other activities, as we also suggest.

Better distribution of effort.— An expanded schedule arranges more evenly the efforts of both teaching and learning. Large blocks of mate .l now compressed into three periods can be shaped into more manageable proportions, promoting more coordinated and efficient classroom treatment. Most textbooks are designed for a four- or five-day schedule; they work best when taught that way. Just as important, the expanded schedule encourages students to adopt a daily routine for working in a regular, focused fashion, a habit essential in a subject as relentlessly cumulative as FL. When we meet students only on MWF we may preach--but cannot actively teach--the virtues of daily routine, focused effort, mastery, completeness, and precision.

More frequent review and testing.— Regular review followed by frequent testing is essential for sound instruction and learning in FL. The additional time will allow us to test more often, and that in turn reduces the material to be covered to an amount that can be more thoroughly reviewed and mastered.

Enhanced liberal arts content.— A small portion of the added time can be used more fully to develop the social-cultural context and the linguistic perspectives that we need to convey in a liberal arts curriculum. In a textbook unit on French television, for example, there ought to be an hour actually to observe French programming. Students ought also to sample the wide and fascinating array of linguistic types, both in the Indo-European and non-IE families, and to see their new language in that larger perspective.

Coverage of the basic structures.— The expanded model will enable us, if we choose, to cover the basics of the language and the first-year textbook in one year. (Chinese and Russian may continue to be exceptions.) The third semester course (FL 31) can then be devoted, as it should, to thorough review and to extending the basic skills. As we introduce the FL 31 Interim Abroad option, it becomes even more important to complete the basics in the first two semesters and to prepare students as thoroughly as possible for this experience.

Advantages to Students

Concrete results.— With more practice, most students will be able to speak and understand more in their new language at the end of two semesters. That increased competence, combined with the option to use the language actively and intensively in a FL 31 Interim Abroad, should provide a powerful incentive to learn, something lacking now in the FL Requirement area.

Putting time to work.— Often formidable on the three-day grind, homework assignments can be shortened on a four- or five-day model. Many, if not all, freshmen have a serious problem managing time and working efficiently. Since the workload remains roughly the same as on the MWF regimen, meeting more frequently helps underclassmen to address these problems by requiring them to be accountable daily for smaller, more coherent assignments.

More gain for pain.— Our language students may be compared to berrypickers struggling through a dense thicket of blackberries. On the present schedule they emerge at the end of a term scratched and bleeding, but with buckets barely half full. The schedule presses them rapidly through the brambles, though at the same time it denies them the opportunity to gather and savor the fruits of their labor. That is the purpose of frequent review and testing: to provide a pause for reflection, relearning, and recovery.

More vitamins and trace minerals.— It should not be any surprise that a FL diet stripped down to grammatical structure, limited oral practice, and a smidgen of cultural or linguistic flavoring out of the textbook, gives most students a bad case of anorexia linguistica. The cultural and linguistic components, however, are more than mere seasoning. They comprise the liberal arts vitamins of FL and nourish students in a way that gives a demanding learning effort meaning by providing a frame of reference. It does not trivialize FL study for students to learn a Norwegian folkdance, for example, or to compare the inflectional patterns of Latin with those of Sanskrit, or to listen to portions of the St. John Passion in German during the Easter season, or to try their hand at Chinese cooking. There must be time for such activities.

Student and parent expectations.— Students (and parents) have a right to expect that the basic language courses at St. Olaf will not lag behind those offered at other institutions. At the end of three terms (one year), a student in French at Carleton has received 171 hours of instruction, while her St. Olaf counterpart receives only 80 hours in one year or 120 hours over three semesters. The Carleton student completes the first-year textbook in the first two terms (20 weeks); at St. Olaf the student in French must wait until the second year to finish the first-year text (28 weeks or more). Quantity, of course, does not always directly convert into quality. But it

strains the imagination to think that the quality of our teaching is so much better or more efficient as to offset the advantage in time that a Carleton student enjoys. Our limited schedule, furthermore, ought not place St. Olaf students at a disadvantage when applying for foreign study, as is the case now, for example, with the CIEE sponsored Leningrad Program. In any event, it is not accurate to give the impression to students and parents that FL training at St. Olaf is necessarily "better than that at the U." Nor can we excuse our schedule by saying, "We have a different system than Concordia." If they are to be thoroughly motivated and engaged, our students need pride of place, a confidence that their FL education is not merely adequate, if indeed it is that, but even superior.

III. Questions, Reservations, Clarifications

How does FL instruction time at St. Olaf compare with that at other colleges? **Table 1**, p. 17, summarizes data for the ACM, Lutheran colleges in our region, and the University of Minnesota. It must be kept in mind that the comparison makes no claims for the quality of the programs surveyed in relation to quality at St. Olaf. These data only establish what is the common pattern of instruction time at other institutions. This pattern is corroborated by scholars in pedagogy who customarily assume, or set, 100+ contact hours per year as the floor level for basic FL instruction (for example, Schulz, MLJ 70 [1986]: 376).

Aren't we confusing "quantity" with "quality" in proposing a schedule increase? No. "Seat time" surely ought not be equated either with quality of instruction or with quality of results. Quality is affected by class size, instructor's preparation, interest, and talent, textbooks and instructional aids, classroom atmosphere, and student motivation and preparation, to name other important factors. Our position follows the intuitive maxim that as instruction time is squeezed towards zero, the results become more and more meager. Experience with intensive FL instruction, conversely, especially French Intensive at St. Olaf, has indicated that with increased instruction time most students appear to achieve greater oral competence and become more motivated. We say this cautiously, since many Intensive students are self-selecting. Authorities in FL education agree that quality hinges directly on instruction time. The programmatic MLA-ACLS report Language Study for the 1980's puts it this way: "The typical institutional time schedule does . . . not provide adequate time for reinforcement and development of skills in language courses" (ed. Richard Brod [NY: MLA, 1980],p. 12). If this is so, then St. Olaf's schedule, which is at the very bottom, even below, what is typical, is certainly inadequate.

"Quantity," in a sense, creates the opportunity for "quality." And if the three-day schedule definitely cramps that opportunity, expanding the

schedule clearly opens up new possibilities for immediate improvements in review and testing, for preparing students for the FL 31 Interim Abroad, for developing liberal arts content, and for classroom practice. But beyond this it also gives us some room to maneuver as we seek to improve our work, either in the cultural and linguistic domains, or in applying proficiency-based methods.

A distinction needs to be made between length of periods and frequency of class meetings. Many of us think that increasing the number of contact periods is as important as adding instruction time. In fact, some proponents of a five-day (250 min.) schedule even see a benefit in reducing class length by 10 min. per period (from 60 to 50 min.), since their experience indicates that intensive practice and concentration deplete student energies at the earlier limit. Those who favor a 4 x 60 (240 min.) schedule would argue that the proper variety and pacing of instruction will sustain student interest.

What impact would an expanded schedule have on teaching loads and staffing? If we had to swallow the increase in load, wouldn't that simply reduce the quality of our teaching overall? Yes. See below, Section IV, for a discussion of staffing options.

Are the benefits of making this change really worth the effort, especially since even a 5 x 50 schedule leaves something to be desired? It is true that adding 60 to 70 min. per week is a little like putting a butterfly bandage on a wound that needs stitches. This modest increment cannot solve completely any of the problems with the three-day schedule. Sixty minutes here and there soon adds up to real time, however. We have shown above that in the long run--over two courses--the benefits are considerable. But what about the costs? If the change can be made without increasing teaching loads, as we propose, and if problems of staffing can be resolved, then the costs in time to us are principally two: the work of preparing and debating a proposal and the extra "start-up" effort to reshape our beginning courses to fit a new pattern. To most of us, the benefits to students alone justify both of these costs. Beyond this, the very act of rethinking basic courses together, of articulating and debating recommendations, and of coming to consensus puts a healthy glow on our entire basic language enterprise.

Before opting for a change of this magnitude, shouldn't we first be clear about our objectives for the FL Requirement? Yes, the greater clarity the better. (The optional "Supplement" considers objectives.) But though a set of objectives is not yet etched in stone, that does not mean that we do not already hold specific, worthwhile goals for our teaching--thorough practice, adequate testing, formation of good habits of study, student motivation, to name several. Added instructional time could help us better realize those aims now. It is hard to imagine any set of objectives, whether they stress proficiency goals or liberal arts perspectives, or some combination of both,

that would not require more than 80 hours of instruction time per year. A recent article on proficiency-oriented instruction notes: "Without question insufficient time is the major obstacle faced by a proficiency-based program" (Schulz, MLJ 70 [1986]: 376). Increasing instruction time is something we can do now that will directly benefit our students now. Beyond this it creates the conditions for considering seriously and perhaps implementing other objectives.

Didn't we try an expanded schedule before, but it didn't work? During the two-year period 1981-83, Spanish, French, Norwegian, and German offered a total of twenty-three sections on the 4 x 50 min. model. These classes all met in the pre-chapel slots 8:00-8:50, 9:00-9:50. A change in the College time schedule apparently ended this experiment. Since the four-day model was not uniformly adopted for all sections, students tended to choose classes meeting at later hours for fewer periods. Chinese and Russian currently operate with success on a five-day and four-day schedule respectively.

Doesn't language lab make up for the lack of practice time in class? No. At best, even with adequate equipment, the language lab can only be a useful aid for student homework. It cannot be monitored or supervised, and the crucial factor of "live" communication is absent. With an increase in classroom practice, it might be feasible even to reduce lab attendance to twice weekly. This is not to minimize the importance of language lab practice, but simply to say that it cannot substitute for actual live instruction.

How can we propose to increase instruction time without empirical evidence that the results would be better than those under the current schedule? This question is complicated by the fact that it is partially spurious. First, it holds the seed of "proficiency reductionism," since the areas that would receive attention are presumably only those which could be measured quantitatively, primarily oral-grammatical skills. But the values of FL study cannot be reduced to skill competence, and there is still no empirical method for accurately evaluating the cultural or linguistic perspectives that we expect students will also acquire. Second, those who might call for empirical evidence know well that it is impossible to create the conditions for valid comparison without elaborate, careful preparation. If we were to compare students at Carleton and St. Olaf, for example, we would have to accept a common textbook and objectives, pre-select students of similar ability, and use identical teaching methods and instruments of evaluation. Third, standard achievement examinations for lower level courses have not been written for some languages and where available are not routinely given in most institutions, in large part because there is no agreement about what should be tested and how. Measuring and comparing oral proficiency on the ACTFL-ETS scale would be interesting, but valid only if we taught our courses along proficiency-based lines. The most practical way to obtain such comparisons

would be to evaluate French Intensive students in relation to students in the three-day cycle. This has not been done, however, and would be problematic, in any case, since a different textbook is used and Intensive students are often self-selecting, therefore probably more motivated to begin with. There is ultimately no simple way on an empirical basis alone to answer the question of which schedule is better.

Most experts hold the view either that instructional time--even at 100 hrs. per year--for beginning languages is too little, or that too much is attempted in too limited a span. Valdman and Warriner-Burke assert, "Students are exposed to one grammatical feature after another without time to drill, use, and develop proficiency in any of them" (FLA 13 [1980]: 264). Many of us have taught extensively on three-day, four-day, five-day schedules, or in intensive programs, and several of us have learned languages in two or more of these modes, as well. While this evidence may not be empirical in a strict sense, it is certainly experientially valid. Given a competent instructor and reasonably motivated students, we concur that both teaching and learning work better on a daily schedule.

Many students are already negative toward the FL Requirement. Doesn't adding more class time just increase their hostility? On the contrary, expanding the schedule allows us to meet this motivation problem head on. For how can FL study stripped of all except token liberal arts content and context be meaningful to students? Can massive doses of homework be perceived by students as anything other than a very unpleasant horse cure? How satisfying can it be to work hard to learn something that one cannot practice adequately in class? The reasons for student hostility toward language study are complex. They may stem from poor high school instruction, lack of good study habits, antipathy toward any requirement, not to mention just plain ethnocentric ignorance. The point is that with the instruction time now available, we can do little to ameliorate any of these problems, and we often simply compound them.

At Carleton, the move from a three-day to a five-day schedule in 1984-85 was questioned at the outset. Students were assured that assignments would not increase in size, and since the change, most students have not shown increased resistance. We, too, can promise students that their workload will not increase beyond the 7 to 9 hours per week currently recommended. But we need to be clear that on the current pattern many students do not now study language daily and few put in the recommended study time. That would change on the new schedule; most students would find it necessary to bring their study effort up closer to the recommended level. That, of course, can only redound to their advantage.

Won't scheduling FL classes on TTh close off schedule options for students on those days, and won't it also impinge on TTh labs, English writing courses, or

religion sections offered on TTh? In most cases, no. In order to ascertain how freshmen, who make up the bulk of enrollees in FL 11, 12(14), use TTh time slots, we studied the schedules of a random sample of 45 freshmen. To this was appended a smaller group of sophomores (15). The results showed clearly that underclass students customarily register for two or fewer T classes and two or fewer Th classes. Most, in fact, took one or fewer courses on both of those days. This leaves approximately 85% with a minimum of two time slots and well over 50% with three available slots on TTh, ample time to schedule language classes without unduly limiting their choice of writing sections, labs, music, or religion offerings. See **Table 2** and **Table 3**, p. 18.

Won't adding TTh periods exacerbate the classroom crunch? Yes. In the Fall, 1986, 34 sections of F 11, 12(14) were offered (excluding Russian and Chinese, which already meet Th and/or T. 34 classroom spaces would therefore be needed throughout the day on TTh. An examination of space available in Old Main in the fall of 1986 showed 21 vacant classrooms on TTh. If non-FL courses meeting in Old Main on those days were accommodated elsewhere, there would be 31 classrooms available, three shy of the needed number. If, on the other hand, each of these sections were divided into two small groups for drill/practice on TTh, the need for space doubles. Although we are sensitive to the space problem, we recognize that classrooms are often underused on TTh and, further, that part of the pressure is caused by the policy of scheduling no classes during the afternoon after 3:05 or 3:25 or in the evening.

Doesn't a four-day or five-day schedule undermine the sanctity of the three class hours = one credit formula? Even worse, doesn't it call into question the entire 4-1-4 calendar? Other departments in the College, notably the science, mathematics, and music areas hardly regard the formula as binding. Chemistry 21, 22, 25, and 26, for example, combine three hourly meetings with one instructor supervised three-hour lab per week for one credit. That pattern is followed with variations in biology and physics. In addition, Physics 26L, 27L, 28, and 44 meet Monday through Friday for 50 min. periods. A lab is required, as well, for Physics 26L and 27L. Mathematics regularly offers an algebra and functions course that meets 4 x 50 min. Music Theory I, II, III, IV, together with concomitant Ear Training and Keyboard sections constitute a one-credit course meeting 3 x 60 min. + 2 x 90 min. per week. A number of applied music courses for 1/4 credit meet 2 x 60 min. weekly, while others may meet 2 x 1 1/2 hrs. for 1/2 credit.

As things now stand in FL, Chinese and Russian follow the lab science model. In Chinese, MWF classes (60 min.) are supplemented by TTh "lab" or practice sessions (50 min. each) directed by non-student native speakers; Russian adds a T practice session (50 min.) to MWF classes (60 min.)(this term the extra session is being taught by the Russian faculty). Greek and Latin often augment MWF classes with student-assisted evening sessions TTh, which

are encouraged but non-mandatory. French Intensive meets MWF (60 min.) for a master class, and students also participate in required drill sessions 3 x 60 min. per week, all for one credit.

The proper question to ask, we would argue, is whether courses across the College are designed so that a rough equivalency obtains in the amount of work students are required to do, not whether they sit in class for the same amount of time. Certain subjects may require more instruction time than others. Clearly FL study is an area which profits from more frequent classroom practice, while writing courses require fewer class meetings but extensive student preparation. We do not think that a student work load of 7 to 9 hrs. weekly for FL, including language lab, violates the principle of equivalency, even if the classes meet more than three times. It is difficult, finally, to see how expanding our schedule could be construed as challenging the 4-1-4 calendar. Other colleges like Gustavus, Luther, and Augsburg have the same calendar but still manage over 100 contact hours in beginning languages per year.

IV. Teaching Loads and Staffing the Expanded Schedule

There is strong agreement among FL colleagues that our teaching loads ought not rise above the current nine hours per week (for a three course semester). The reasons for this do not stem from a question of compensation but, rather, from concern for the quality of our work overall and for freedom to pursue tasks other than teaching beginning languages. Even at nine contact hours, there is precious little time for serious scholarly work, especially when six of those hours are invested in first and second year language courses. But at least there is a modest opportunity for research and writing. Those of us who have taught 12 or more periods weekly (even if they were 50 min. each) still bear the marks of those experiences. Under such conditions, classes must be prepared hastily, professional growth and development dwindle, work on committees becomes pure drudgery, and after a few years, the creative flame in teaching is virtually snuffed out. We believe that if a higher teaching load were exacted, any gains to our students from increasing instruction time would be more than cancelled by the reduction in quality of our teaching and the ensuing demoralization.

It may be useful here to review the average time requirements for teaching just one section of Fl 11 on the three-day cycle. These figures vary according to class size, teaching experience, familiarity with textbooks, and so forth, but the estimate here should be fairly accurate, even conservative, within the ranges stated. A class of 20 students is assumed.

	Per Period	Per week
Preparation time	1-2 hrs.	3-6 hrs.

Grading time	2.5-3 hrs.	7.5-9 hrs.
Overall Prep. Subtotal	3.5-5 hrs.	10.5-15 hrs.
Instruction time	1 hr.	3 hrs.
Total	4.5-6 hrs.	13.5-18 hrs.

(When student workers help with grading, the amount is closer to the lower figure.) This figure does not include office conferences, individual oral interviews, the grading of exams, or record keeping. These would add perhaps another 40+ hours to the semester total.

If a decision is reached to increase instruction time, we ask the FL faculty and the Administration of the College to consider the following options for staffing:

A. the use of trained student apprentices (SA's) for directing practice sessions;
B. a reduced load procedure;
C. some combination of both.

The Student Apprentice System

Description.— Upper level students and majors judged competent after study abroad, or native speaker students, could be hired on a work-study basis to serve as apprentices. One student would normally serve as an apprentice for one section of Fl 11, 12(14) and meet that class twice a week (5 hrs. work per week). If the class were subdivided into two groups for drill, apprentices would direct four sessions a week (10 hrs. work per week, counting preparation time and perhaps some grading). These students would be responsible only for practice/drill sessions and some grading. They would be recruited, trained, and supervised by a coordinator assigned by each department. Serving as an apprentice would be recognized as an honor reserved for the best students.

Requirements.—

1) Some 25-30 student assistant positions per year, if all languages (except Chinese and Russian, which already use native speaker assistants) follow this approach. More students would be required first semester than second.

2) One coordinator each for French, German, Spanish, Norwegian, with one course per year released time to prepare materials, recruit, train, and supervise the apprentices. A two or three-day training workshop would take place during Freshman Orientation each year.

Advantages.—

1) The student apprentice system creates a very valuable motivational "ecosystem" that closely ties students from the advanced levels of FL study to those at the beginning levels. On the one side, the beginning students see what advanced students have accomplished; they profit especially from their tutors' enthusiasm for language and for the culture of their "new" country. The apprentices, on the other hand, need an opportunity to reflect on and to share what they have learned in their period of foreign study and travel. They would also welcome the chance to do something productive with their language and would gain an understanding of the teaching profession into the bargain. The apprenticeship program would also help them get through the often difficult transition from foreign study back into the St. Olaf community. For both groups and for the FL programs as a whole, this system has immensely practical and powerful advantages.

2) Teaching loads and number of contact periods for instructors would remain the same; no adjustments need be made in this sensitive area.

3) It is the least expensive way to provide extra staff, costing approximately half of what a reduced load alternative would require. Perhaps we could draw on the current student work program for funding, reassigning some student workers to roles as student apprentices.

4) The student apprentice system follows the model refined in French Intensive at St. Olaf and in Romance Languages at Carleton for the use of trained language assistants. We would benefit from that experience, which has generally been quite good.

5) With diligence, we ought to be able to corral grant money to help offset development costs.

Disadvantages.—

1) Some instructors may feel that they no longer have total control over their class and may not like the idea of using a common textbook for all sections of the same class.

2) Administrative duties may increase for the department chair, though some could be handled by the SA coordinator.

3) Classics do not require oral practice, and student apprentices would need to be used in a different way, perhaps to supervise grammar review, practice, and help sessions.

4) Norwegian might have difficulty at this time recruiting enough student assistants, and we could not guarantee that there would always be a sufficient supply of qualified apprentices for French, German, and Spanish.

A Reduced Load Alternative

Description.— Where student-assisted instruction is not feasible, or when sufficient apprentices are not available, some staffing alternative is called for, perhaps a reduced load option. In this mode the instructor would meet the class four or five times weekly. Such a system might work as follows:

1) Each expanded FL 11, 12(14) would be worth 1 1/3 regular courses (60-70 min. more time per week divided by 180 min. per regular course per week = 1/3 more instruction time).

2) Accumulating three such courses would entitle an instructor to one course reduced load. Thus, if an instructor taught two sections of FL 11 during Semester I and one of FL 12 during Semester II, her load could be set at five for the year, or at five for the following year. If the instructor taught only two expanded courses during the year, the course load would remain six courses for the year and a 2/3 course credit would be carried over to the following year. The course reduction would normally, but not necessarily, come from FL 11, 12(14) and not from higher level courses.

3) Alternatively, an instructor might choose to accept the standard six course load and "bank" the credit earned in teaching the expanded FL 11, 12(14) until nine such courses had been taught and three course credits had accumulated. Then she could apply for a semester's professional development leave at full pay. This leave would be used for scholarly and professional development purposes. It would not be regarded as a sabbatical leave, to which the instructor would still be entitled at the regular time.

Requirements.—

1) Replacement staff: in Norwegian, for example, which offered 12 sections of N 11 and 12 in 1986-87, the number of courses requiring extra staff would run between three and four per year. In French, German, and Spanish, replacements would be needed to teach four to five courses per year per language. For these four languages, we would estimate the yearly replacement figure at about 18 total. If this system were used only as a backup to the student apprentice model, on the other hand, the figure would be much lower.

2) Part-time staff would need to be compensated directly at a higher rate for teaching expanded FL 11, 12(14) sections.

Advantages.—

1) Reduction in load would continue to insure a respectable quality of instruction. Instructors would remain in total control over all aspects of their beginning courses.

2) The "banking" approach would spur professional growth and forestall burnout.

Disadvantages.—

1) If applied in all the languages at once, this approach would be about twice as costly as a student apprentice program.

2) FL departments would have to rely more on part-time faculty. This would require more time to be spent in evaluating and hiring part-time colleagues. Permanent 1/2 or 2/3 time positions could be considered, however. Part-time faculty might be more difficult to find, particularly if they had to drive from the Cities to Northfield four or five times a week.

3) The powerful "ecosystem" advantage of the student apprentice program could not be exploited.

4) Departmental record-keeping would be more complicated.

5) Even with a reduced load, some colleagues could face a weekly schedule of 13 contact periods some terms (5 + 5 + 3 meetings), and in general it would not be possible to keep T or Th free for scholarly work or other professional activity.

V. Conclusion

In preparing this report, we have tried to describe the need for increasing instruction time both from our own perspective as well as from that of our students. Our argument does not rest primarily on the claim that more class time makes students more competent in language skills, though we obviously hope to reap benefits from more in-class practice. Our case does include the view that more instruction time will enable us to convey more adequately the cultural and linguistic perspectives within which rigorous and systematic daily efforts gain meaning for students. Alongside problems in gaining competence, other matters concern us profoundly: student motivation, time management, and the liberal arts content of beginning FL courses. In addition to documenting the advantages of expanded courses, the report

presents data on FL schedules at other colleges and on the TTh schedules of freshmen. All of the questions, opinions, and reservations that arose in earlier discussion have been treated extensively and fairly. And finally, the report outlines staffing options, though it does not present a cost analysis.

The report should not be read as expressing the final, official point of view of the various FL departments. We hope only that it will serve as the basis for collective discussion and action yet this semester. Nevertheless, in our discussions, consultations, and drafting of proposals, we have tried to reach a consensus that ultimately can represent our position to the entire College.

Members of the ad hoc Planning Group

David Sudermann and Norman Watt, German (Conveners)
Jolene Barjasteh, French
Richard Bodman, Chinese
James Dunlop, Spanish
Lloyd Gunderson, Classics
James Walker, Russian
Solveig Zempel, Norwegian

Acknowledgments

Special thanks go to Lori Burow in John Lygre's office for gathering information on freshman and sophomore schedules. Pat Smith, the Assistant Registrar, provided data on the Class of 1986 for the survey and table included in the "Supplement." Though they might not all wish to claim this "Report" as their own, Leon Narvaez, Wendy Allen, and John Lygre all gave valuable advice. Wendy Allen proved a willing source of information on current pedagogy in foreign languages. Mary Cisar offered many suggestions and helped edit the documents. Louis Janus and Jim Mayer participated in one or more of the planning group sessions. At Carleton, Cathy Yandell and Genvieve Soulas-Link graciously provided detailed information about the student assistant program.

March 5, 1987

TABLE 1

FL SCHEDULES AT ACM AND REGIONAL LUTHERAN COLLEGES
FIRST-YEAR LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

College	System	Weekly Schedule[1]	Contact hrs. per year[2]	Contact periods per year[2]	Language Requirement
Concordia (Mnd)	Semester (15)	5 x 70 min.	163	140	no/Distribution
Carleton	Trimester (10)	5 x 70=1,2,3 qt. 3 x 70=3 qt.(G/R)	149-171	128-147	4 terms (184-206 hrs.)
Colorado	3.5 wk. term	5 x 4 hrs.	140	?	?
Knox	Trimester (10)	5 x 50-70	122-171	147	3 terms (122-171 hrs.)
Monmouth	Trimester (10)	5 x 50	122	147	2 terms (122 hrs.)
Lawrence	Trimester (10)	3x70+2x60	120-147	120-147	?
Beloit	Semester (15)	4 x 60	120	120	no/Advise
Lake Forest	Semester (15)	5 x 50	116	140	no/Advise
U. Minnesota	Quarter (10)	5 x 45	110	147	6 terms/Prof. (220 hrs.)
Gustavus	4-1-4 (13)	5 x 50	108	130	no/Distribution
(St. Olaf proposed)	**4-1-4 (13)**	**4x60, 5x50, 3x60+2x50**	**104-121**	**104-130**	**3 terms (144-161 hrs.)**
Grinnell	Semester (15)	4x50, 5x50	100-116	120-140	no/Advise
Luther	4-1-4 (13)	4 x 60	104	104	1 term (52 hrs.)
Augsburg	4-1-4 (13)	4 x 60	100-104	104	2 terms (100-104 hrs.)
Ripon	Semester (15)	4 x 50	100	120	2 semesters (100 hrs.)
Macalester	4-1-4	4 x 50	86	104	no/Distribution
Augustana SxF	4-1-4 (13)	4 x 50	86	104	1 course after Placement
Coe	4-1-4 (13)	3 x 60	80	80	no/Advise
St. Olaf	4-1-4 (13)	3 x 60	80	80	3 terms (120 hrs.)

[1] A portion of the data come from current class schedules and was obtained courtesy of the Registrar's Offices of these colleges or, less often, from faculty members in the languages. Other data come from recent college catalogs. The figures represent the time set aside officially for first-year classes. This figure may not always coincide with actual instruction time. At Knox, for instance, instructors have the option of teaching 50 or 70 min. periods. Where this could be ascertained, it was included as a spread of contact hours. At Grinnell, French and Spanish meet on a 4x50 basis, while German and Russian follow the 5x50 model. At Carleton, German and Russian meet 3x70 in the third term.

[2] On semester schedules (15 wks.) we have reckoned with five days break for a total of 70 periods per semester. For 4-1-4 systems a flat figure of 13 wks. per semester was used, or 65 periods at 5x per week. This figure accomodates five days of vacation. The actual tally for the fall term, 1986, on the 3x60 schedule was 40 periods. Quarter or trimester terms consist of 10 wks. minus one day break for 49 periods total on the 5x plan or 147 periods per year.

TABLE 2

HOW DO FRESHMEN USE TUESDAY-THURSDAY TIME SLOTS?

(Forty-five Random Freshmen, Fall 1986)

	Nos. of Freshmen Registering for TTh Slots, Arranged by No. of Periods, Ascending								
	None	60 Min.	1 Period	1 P.+60m.	2 Periods	2 P.+60m.	3 Periods	3 P.+60m.	No. Sampled
Tuesday	3	0	22	4	9	1	5	1	= 45
Thursday	5	0	25	3	9	1	2	0	= 45

Note: Four 1 1/2 hour slots plus two 60 min. periods (7:45-8:45, 8:55-9:55) are available on T and Th. Labs running from 1:55 - 4:55 were tallied as one period, since only one time slot exists between 3:25 and 4:55. Read Table 2 as follows: "On Tuesdays 3 of 45 freshmen took no classes, 22 registered for one (1 1/2 hr.) period, 4 freshmen registered for one period plus one 60 min. period, etc."

Partial Percentage Breakdown of Table 2

% of Freshmen using	one or fewer	Tuesday periods	56%
% of Freshmen using	one or fewer	Thursday periods	67%
% of Freshmen using	two or fewer	Tuesday periods	84%
% of Freshmen using	two or fewer	Thursday periods	93%
% of Freshmen using	more than two	Tuesday periods	16%
% of Freshmen using	more than two	Thursday periods	7%

Note: A small random sample of 15 Sophomores showed slightly higher use of TTh periods: 73% (11) used two or fewer T periods; 87% used two or fewer Th slots.

TABLE 3

WHICH TUESDAY-THURSDAY PERIODS ARE USED MOST AND LEAST?

(45 Random Freshmen, Fall 1986)

	No. of Freshmen Registered on TTh, Arranged by Specific Time Slot					
	60 min.	60 min.	1 1/2 hr	1 1/2 hr.	1 1/2 hr	1 1/2 hr
	7:45-8:45	8:55-9:55	8:25-9:55	10:35-12:05	12:15-1:45	1:55-3:25
Tuesday	1	5	16	20	17	11
Thursday	4	5	16	18	11	7

An Adequate Foreign Language Requirement:

Objectives and Strategy

(Supplement to the Report of the ad hoc Planning Group)

During the planning group meetings it became clear that important presuppositions about language learning and about the liberal arts purpose of a FL requirement underlay discontent with the current schedule. What follows here is a brief iteration of those presuppositions, first, as a way of placing the proposed schedule change in a larger context, but also in order to present a strategy for making the FL requirement more purposeful. The "Supplement" begins with a statement of goals, general in scope, to which nearly all of us can subscribe. It then presents a critique of the FL requirement at St. Olaf in light of these objectives and on the basis of a statistical survey of language courses taken by the Class of 1986. The concluding statements of objectives and strategy move from the general to the specific in the attempt, not to express an ideal state of affairs, but merely to describe an adequate requirement, one that can begin to support St. Olaf's claims for quality and international focus. Whether the College as a whole is prepared to support such a requirement is another question. We have an obligation, nonetheless, to make clear to ourselves and the College what an adequate requirement amounts to.

This document was prepared by one of the conveners of the planning group and does not neccessarily represent the views of the ad hoc group. It should be viewed only as a planning document, a first step, perhaps, toward revising the FL requirement.

General Goals of FL Study

Since the early 1960's, FL departments in the United States have supported beginning study that aims to train students not merely to learn the grammar and forms of a language but also to develop a confident feel for the right sounds and patterns and begin to concatenate these patterns to form more complex utterances. In the present decade we have come to accept, as well, that even for the earliest levels, meaningful speech originates in a context of human associations. We have therefore added to our goals the elements of social-cultural context. For the last half dozen years, we have engaged in a discussion about "proficiency," usually referring to competence in speaking and listening, but often including reading and writing skills, measured according to national standards. While all FL pedagogues support methods that raise competency in speaking and listening, thereby increasing what students are concretely able to "do" in their new language, most also agree that not all of the values of FL study are characterizable in terms of proficiency, especially the humanistic values associated with linguistic and cultural perspectives. Insofar as these liberal arts perspectives provide the context within which both structure and communication become meaningful--hence help to motivate practice and regular homework--our beginning courses strive to balance competency and liberal studies objectives.

Critique of the FL Requirement at St. Olaf

The obstacles to meeting these broad goals posed by lack of instruction time are specified in the preceding report. Though significant, the want of instruction time makes up only one dimension of the larger requirement picture. FL requirement courses ought to raise and answer three primary questions: What is language? What sort of culture and people does this new language reveal? What can I do with three terms of a second language? For most St. Olaf students the answers are regrettably negative. Though they may have learned a great deal in three courses, their knowledge remains fragmentary, speaking and listening skills barely at survival level, and writing and reading still largely undeveloped. Until the FL 31 Interim Abroad is inaugurated next fall (1987) in Spanish, German, and French, there is no opportunity in an intensive and natural way to try out their new language within the framework of the language requirement. And in three short terms--120 total hours of instruction--we cannot hope sufficiently to develop the cultural and language dimensions to shed much light on the first two questions.

For instructors, the FL Requirement enterprise has been reduced to a struggle to compress structures and forms into the allotted time, to provide a modicum of practice, to pump energy and discipline into mostly unmotivated learners, and to propel them along to a passing grade in the third semester. In the Class of 1986, 88% of the nearly 500 students who began a FL at the level of FL 31 or below never went beyond the second year of language study (FL 32[34]). Of the more than 275 students who started the uphill grind with FL 11(13) in the four languages, French, German, Norwegian, Spanish, 89% had fallen by the wayside before or by the end of FL 31. Only 14 students out of this 275 (5%) succeeded in climbing up over the ridge of FL 32(34) where they could look out on the Promised Land. For our foreign language programs as a whole, therefore, the FL requirement fosters a two-tier system: the masses at the bottom drop away quite early and are gone by the end of the third term (FL 31) leaving just a handful that filters through to join the small elite placing into second year language or higher. Only this higher "caste" advances to the heights of upper level courses, study abroad, and somewhat greater competency. In spite of the fact that 80% of the students we teach at all levels of FL are enrolled in FL 31 or below, some colleagues even speak of teaching these courses as a "service to the College," a duty stoically to be endured so that we may then focus on tasks of more intellectual substance and personal relevance. On balance, students are not required, and most do not wish, to progress to a point where language acquisition brings tangible rewards, and teachers cannot afford to make a full emotional commitment to an effort that bears such meager results.

The Class of '86: A Foreign Language Profile

A review of the language courses taken by last year's graduates underscores these observations. The survey centers on two main questions: How many students who began language at FL 31 or below advanced beyond the FL 31 level? How many progressed beyond four semesters? These questions rest in turn on two premises about the language learning experience.

First, for language training to be useful and somewhat satisfying, students must reach a level of skill proficiency somewhere in the Intermediate Low to High range on the ACTFL-ETS scale, or Level 1/1+ on the Foreign Service Institute scale (the FSI scale ranges from 0 to 5). At the low end of the 1/1+ ladder in oral proficiency students are able "to satisfy basic survival needs and minimum courtesy requirements," while at the high end they are able "to satisfy most survival needs and limited social demands." FSI experience

has shown that for languages like French, Norwegian, and Spanish, reaching the 1/1+ level normally requires some 240 hours of instruction in an intensive mode. (See Addendum.) At the end of three semesters St. Olaf students have received scarcely half of that found necessary. It is unlikely that students in our system can reach level 1/1+ on this amount of instruction.

Second, our experience shows that in acquiring spoken languages many students reach a watershed at about the end of the second year of study, or at about 240 hours of instruction. (This may take longer in Classics, Chinese, or Russian.) By this time students have learned the basic structures, read with less difficulty, and the cultural input has been sufficient to whet their curiosity. At this point the satisfactions of learning begin to outweigh the efforts, the option for foreign study opens up, and student interest can become self-sustaining. Most St. Olaf students never reach this critical juncture.

[TABLE 4]

The results of the table may be summarized in the following fashion:

80% of the 501 students in all languages who began at FL 31 (third term) or below did not advance beyond the three semester requirement. When students in Chinese, Greek, Latin, and Russian are excluded--they are more self-selecting--the percentage for the other four rises to 82% who did not progress beyond three terms.

87% of the 322 students who began language study in FL 11(13) failed to progress beyond the three terms required. For the four major languages the figure is 89%. Only the somewhat better success rate in French 11 (13) (85%) kept the percentage from going above 90%.

Students who place into FL 12(14,20) (second term) are more likely to go on beyond the requirement, and those who place into FL 31 are more apt still to continue. Nevertheless, over three-fourths starting in FL 12(14,20) drop out before or immediately after FL 31(33), and about three-fifths starting in FL 31 do not go on.

While 18% of the 450 students in the four major languages who began at FL 31 or below continued on to FL 32(34) (fourth term) fewer than 11% (48 students) made it over the second year hurdle of FL study. (Some few may have ascended to third-year level in a second foreign language, however.)

In short, only 59 students of the 501 who took any FL at the level of FL 31 or below reached a point (above FL 32[34]) where the language might have been minimally usable or genuinely meaningful. 14 students placed into FL 32(34) or above, and 13 of these took at least one third-year course; perhaps 10 may have been competent enough at entrance to have skipped the requirement entirely. Allowing for a generous margin of error, then, the total number of '86 B.A. graduates having barely adequate training in a FL (at least four semesters) hardly reaches 90 out of 470.

Objectives for an Adequate Foreign Language Requirement

The "Statements of Objectives of Core Curriculum" adopted by the Faculty, 10-10-78, epitomize the main goal for FL as "to teach efficiently as much language as possible in the time period allowed." Given the limits

imposed by the current requirement and time schedules, that laconic formulation is probably all that can be promised. The "Statement" goes on to specify three slightly more concrete results, "to provide the foundation for a set of skills, . . . to provide . . . an increased understanding of language as a human phenomenon, . . . to foster an acquaintanceship with a foreign culture. . . ." In a similar vein, Valdman and Warriner-Burke list five objectives: 1) appreciation of humanistic values of learning a second language, 2) motivation to continue study, 3) ability to understand spoken language, to speak, to read, and to write at the appropriate level, 4) limited grasp of cultural factors, 5) insight into language as a structural system and into ways of learning it (FLA 13 [1980]: 262-63).

While most of us heartily endorse aims of this sort, they are still too general for practical application. At the moment, moreover, there is no national agreement on what the right mix of these objectives should be for beginning FL courses or what proficiency levels to strive for. The result is that while current scholarly discussion offers important guidelines and promising suggestions for proficiency methods, we cannot fall back either on general statements or on scholarly authority to express workable goals for St. Olaf, but must also draw on the particularities of the institution, its students, and on our own experience.

The main force of the objectives below is to give the FL Requirement purpose and direction it now lacks by tying it directly to concrete performance goals, to a context creating humanities frame, to the larger network of reinforcing liberal studies, and to a foreign study opportunity.

I. For the spoken languages we should introduce proficiency-based methods for the speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills of the FL Requirement. As distinct from proficiency-based testing, PB methods follow the traditional practice/drill approach but with important improvements. They require that exercises be set within a realistic cultural context; they emphasize genuine communication in small group practice; language is employed naturally with respect to social-cultural norms; they permit us to work on oral-listening proficiency in contexts that students are likely to encounter in foreign study and travel. (Omaggio, 1984.)

II. Proficiency goals should also be phased in for at least the four major spoken languages and tentatively set at a minimum of "Intermediate-Intermediate High" on the ACTFL-ETS scale (1/1+ FSI). Demonstrating proficiency need not and should not be the exclusive means of evaluation, however.

III. Requirement level courses should introduce basic information about the language as a system and about its historical change, together with abundant contrasts and comparisons with English.

IV. The contemporary (or ancient) cultural ambiance--political life and attitudes, law, religion, work, popular culture, family, friendship, education, women's experience, social patterns and customs of all sorts--and its contrast with American habits and attitudes should be developed as a context for language learning.

V. Instruction (competency strategies) for the spoken languages should focus specifically on preparing students for participation in for-

eign study programs in their new language as early as FL 31 for French, German, Norwegian, and Spanish in a three-course requirement, or at the FL 32(34) level in a four-course requirement. Such an opportunity should be open to any student with a grade of C+ or better in FL 12(14), alternatively FL 31(33).

VI. The short-range objective of foreign study should not eclipse the long-range goal of preparing every student to continue FL beyond FL 31 or 34. In other words, the necessary emphasis on "survival" proficiency should not supplant the thorough, rigorous training a student may ultimately need to attain fluency or mastery.

VII. Each beginning course should offer propaedeutic instruction on how to learn and study a foreign language.

VIII. Beginning FL students should be made aware of the important connections between language courses and the various "Studies" programs, Ancient and Medieval, Asian, Hispanic, Russian, and also Women's Studies.

These objectives can hardly be thought radical or too idealistic. Many of us try now to incorporate them into our teaching "in the time period allotted." At least one, the FL 31 Interim is on the drawing board for next year. The crucial question is whether the College is prepared to support these goals fully for its students. Full realization would require something like the strategy below for revamping the FL Requirement.

Revision Strategy

Stage I (1987-88)

1) Increase instruction time from 80 to 104-120 contact hours per year for first-year courses. (The purpose of this "Report.")

2) Design and implement FL 31 Interim Abroad for French, German, Spanish (and Norwegian?).

3) Add FL 12 Intensive Interim in German and Norwegian to parallel French Intensive 20 and Spanish 14 Interim. (Provides an accelerated track.)

Stage II (1988-89)

4) Set class size for first four semesters at 18-20 maximum per class.

5) Introduce Entrance Standard set to be equivalent to one year of college study or proficiency at the level of "Novice High" to be measured by standard evaluation at entrance. (Exceptions: Chinese, Russian, Classics FL 11-12 could still be taken for credit. [Norwegian ?]) This standard parallels that of the University of Minnesota.

6) Revise Graduation Requirement to require a level equivalent to two years of college study and/or proficiency at the minimum level of "Intermediate-Mid" (ACTFL-ETS scale; 1/1+ on FSI scale.)

7) Withdraw the FL 31 Interim Abroad and replace with FL 34 Interim Abroad. This option would continue to serve as the final semester course FL 32(34)I of the graduation requirement.

Stage III (1989-90)

8) Consider adjustments, such as increase in instruction time, if necessary, for FL 31, 32(34) from 80 to 104 hours for the two-course sequence.

To develop fully such a strategy with rationale, details of required changes, implications for staffing, options for faculty development and funding obviously exceeds the scope of this supplement, not to mention the energies of its drafter. It is important to stress, however, that the various stages are bound together by a broad liberal arts concern to provide St. Olaf graduates with purposeful FL training. Our objectives and this strategy guarantee an increase in purpose and meaning over the current requirement by providing

--more adequate instruction time,

--a greater sense of what the learner can do with the language,

--a strong incentive for learning by providing study abroad as a requirement level option,

—an opportunity to take portions of the requirement on an accelerated basis and progress more rapidly.

Selected Bibliography

Arendt, Jermaine D., Lange, Dale L. and Wakefield, Ray. "Strengthening the Language Requirement at the University of Minnesota: An Initial Report." FLA 19 (1986): 49-56.

Language Study for the 1980's. Reports of the MLA-ACLS Language Task Forces. Edited by Richard Brod. N.Y.: MLA, 1980.

Omaggio, Alice C. "The Proficiency-Oriented Classroom." Proficiency: The Organizing Principle. Edited by Theodore v. Higgs. Skokie: National Textbook Co., 1983, pp. 43-84.

Proficiency and the Profession. ADFL Bulletin 18 (Sept, 1986). [Thirteen articles on FL and proficiency.]

Schulz, Renate A. "From Achievement to Proficiency through Classroom Instruction: Some Caveats." MLJ 70 (1986): 373-79.

Valdman, Albert, and Warriner-Burke, Helen P. "Major Surgery Due: Redesigning the Syllabus and Texts." FLA 13 (1980): 261-70.

March 5, 1987

TABLE 4

TABLE 4: THE CLASS OF '86 -- A FL PROFILE OF 470 B.A. GRADUATES

	Start with FL 11(13)				Start with FL12(14,20)			Start with FL 31			Totals							% Totals			% Start FL11(13)		%Start FL12/14		% Start FL31					
	Total No. Starting in FL 11(13)	No. Not Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	No. Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	No. Advancing Beyond FL 32(34)	Total Starting in FL 12(14,20)	No. Not Advancing Beyond FL 31	No. Advancing Beyond FL 31	Total Starting in FL 31	No. Not Advancing Beyond FL 31	No. Advancing Beyond FL 31	Total Taking at Least One Course in FL Starting at FL 31 or Below	Total Not Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	Total Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	No. Starting at FL 31 or Below Who Advanced Beyond FL 32(34) = 4 Terms	Total Starting at FL 32(34) or Above	Total Taking at Least One Course in a Given FL at St. Olaf		% Not Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	% Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	% Advancing Beyond FL 32(34)	% Not Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	% Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	% Not Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	% Advancing Beyond FL 31(33)	% Not Advancing Beyond FL 31	% Advancing Beyond FL 31		Studied More than 1 Lang., None Above FL31(33)	Studied More than 1 Lang., One Above FL31(33)	No. Participating in St.O Interim Abroad	No. of Majors	No. of Majors Starting at FL 31 or Below
Chinese (+Asian St.)	6	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	2	1	0	7		NM										4	1	0	1	1
French	61	52	9	6	32	21	11	29	21	8	122	94	28	17	9	131		77	23	16	85	15	66	34	72	28		12	9	22	12	8
German	78	70	8	3	33	29	4	26	14	12	137	113	24	11	2	139		82	18	8	90	10	88	12	54	46		11	6	2	5	5
Greek	12	6	6	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	6	7	5	0	13		NM		39	NM							3	5	0	1	1
(Classics) Latin	26	21	5	5	0	0	0	2	1	1	28	22	6	4	0	28		79	21	14	81	19	-	-	50	50		4	5	0	(3) 2	(3) 2
Norwegian	68	61	7	5	1	0	1	4	0	4	73	61	12	10	0	73		84	16	14	90	10	-	100	-	100		4	3	0	9	9
Russian	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	1	0	3		NM										0	0	0	1	1
Spanish (+ Hisp. St.)	68	63	5	1	10	8	2	40	28	12	118	99	19	10	3	121		84	16	8	93	7	80	20	70	30		4	3	6	5	5
French + German Norweg.+ Spanish	275	246	29	14	76	58	18	99	63	36	450	367	83	48	14	464		82	18	11	89	11	76	24	64	36		31	21	30	31	27
All FL's	322	280	42	26	76	58	18	104	64	40	501	401	100	59	14	519		80	20	12	87	13	76	24	62	38		42	32	30	39	32
	Students Starting at FL 31 or Below																	% Starting at FL 31 or Below														

ADDENDUM

From "Oral Proficiency Assessment: An Introduction," a handout compiled by Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro of the Educational Testing Service, 1983.

EXPECTED LEVELS OF ABSOLUTE SPEAKING PROFICIENCY IN LANGUAGES TAUGHT AT THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE (Revised April 1973)

This chart was drawn up by the School of Language Studies of the Foreign Service Institute. It summarizes our experience with students as taught in our own classes rather than our judgments about the relative difficulty of these languages for speakers of English though there is undoubtedly some correlation. The expected speaking proficiency for a student with a given background and a given aptitude, in a given language, after a given number of weeks, will depend not only on the difficulty of the spoken language itself, but also on the amount of time and effort that the student has had to spend in concurrent study of the writing system.

GROUP I: Afrikaans, Danish, Dutch, French, Haitian Creole, Italian, Norwegian, Portuguese, Romanian, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish

Length of Training*	Aptitude for Language Learning: Minimum	Average	Superior
8 weeks (240 hours)	1	1/1+	1+
16 weeks (480 hours)	1+	2	2+
24 weeks (720 hours)	2	2+	3

GROUP II: Bulgarian, Dari, Farsi, German, Greek, Hindi, Indonesian, Malay, Urdu

Length of Training	Aptitude for Language Learning: Minumum	Average	Superior
16 weeks (480 hours)	1	1/1+	1+/2
24 weeks (720 hours)	1+	2	2+/3
44 weeks (1320 hours)	2/2+	2+/3	3/3+

GROUP III: Amharic, Bengali, Burmese, Czech, Finnish, Hebrew, Hungarian, Khmer (Cambodian), Lao, Nepali, Pilipino, Polish, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Sinhale, Thai, Tamil, Turkish, Vietnamese

Length of Training	Aptitude for Language Learning: Minimum	Average	Superior
16 weeks (480 hours)	0+	1	1/1+
24 weeks (720 hours)	1+	2	2/2+
44 weeks (1320 hours)	2	2+	3

GROUP IV: Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean

Length of Training	Aptitude for Languge Learning: Minimum	Average	Superior
16 weeks (480 hours)	0+	1	1
24 weeks (720 hours)	1	1+	1+
44 weeks (1320 hours)	1+	2	2+
80-92 weeks (2400-2760 hours)	2+	3	3+

*The number of hours is the theoretical maximum at 30 hours a week.

(The question to be asked with this table is whether the intensive mode of instruction practiced at the FSI School of Language Studies is more or less efficient than the non-intensive mode at St. Olaf. If we assume that FSI students receiving five or six hours of instruction per day do less homework than our students, then perhaps we could get the same results with somewhat less instruction time. How much less would be pure speculation, though 120 hours would surely be insufficient to reach level 1/1+ even in Group I languages.)